

progress toward making Congress more transparent and accountable to those we serve.

In 2010, I introduced a resolution calling for a 72-hour period of public availability before the House could bring a bill up for a vote, so Members of the House and the public could actually see what was in a bill before we were asked to vote for it. In 2011, the proposal was adopted into House rules as a 3-day rule.

But, sadly, this year's House rules package abolished that rule. It is incredibly sad to see that this House is moving backward and making government less open and less accountable to those we were sent here to represent.

CREATING A COVID-19 VICTIMS AND SURVIVORS MEMORIAL DAY

(Mr. STANTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STANTON. Madam Speaker, last week, we mourned half a million American lives lost to the coronavirus. Their absence in our communities is difficult to comprehend.

Sadly, many are facing the reality that it has now been more than a year without their loved ones. Tragically, many of them died alone, without loved ones to say good-bye.

To honor and memorialize those lost and those impacted by the virus, I introduced a resolution designating the first Monday in March as COVID-19 Victims and Survivors Memorial Day. Commemorating this memorial day is an important marker for all those affected across the country and to help our country heal from this trauma.

In my home State, this day of recognition has been pushed by two advocates who lost their fathers to COVID-19. Kristin Urquiza and Tara Krebbs turned their grief into action and have mobilized more than 100 cities and multiple States to recognize today as a memorial day.

Long after our Nation moves beyond this ordeal, we will need to collectively recognize all that we have lost and the trauma of what we have experienced.

Together, we can overcome.

A BILL FOR POLITICIANS, NOT PEOPLE

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, the top priority bill of the House of Representatives this year for the Democrats seems to be H.R. 1, known as the For the People Act.

What people is this going to benefit? For the politicians act, you might call it. It helps politicians and hacks like The Lincoln Project, not the people.

For example, if this bill passes, a political candidate raising approximately \$800,000 in their campaign under cer-

tain guidelines could have the Federal Government match funds up to \$6 million that could be used for anything put into campaign—\$6 million of your Federal dollars going into a single congressional race under the right conditions.

These formulas are geared to ratchet up from the previous election cycle. As we know, campaigns get more expensive each time; so does the match.

Also, under this bill, the Federal Government would hand out \$25 vouchers to every voter in three chosen States to donate to candidates. How much will that cost just to administer a program like that? We know the Federal Government doesn't do that cheaply, maybe \$25 per check to give each \$25 contribution.

If you hand a bureaucrat a hammer, they will see everything as a nail. The new system fines more people in order to raise funds for this campaign giveaway. The fines will go up, and businesses will be hurt, all in order to provide something not for the people.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BROWNLEY) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 1, 2021.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 1, 2021, at 1:35 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 422.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. REEVES,
Deputy Clerk.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1919

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PHILLIPS) at 7 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 1, 2021.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 1, 2021, at 4:30 p.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S. Res. 79.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. REEVES,
Deputy Clerk.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1, FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1280, GEORGE FLOYD JUSTICE IN POLICING ACT OF 2021; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 179 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 179

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1) to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration or their respective designees; (2) the further amendments described in section 2 of this resolution; (3) the amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution; and (4) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. After debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 3 of this resolution shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time after debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution for the chair of the Committee on House Administration or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed

of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 4. All points of order against the further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 5. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1280) to hold law enforcement accountable for misconduct in court, improve transparency through data collection, and reform police training and policies. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 6. The following resolutions are hereby adopted:

(a) House Resolution 176.

(b) House Resolution 177.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, today, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 179, providing for consideration of H.R. 1, the For the People Act of 2021, under a structured rule. It self-executes a manager's amendment by Chairperson LOFGREN and makes in order 56 amendments.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on House Administration and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 1280, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021, under a closed rule. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary and provides for one motion to recommit.

The rule also deems as passed H. Res. 176, which directs the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the engrossment of H.R.

1319, and H. Res. 177, which authorizes candidates for election to the House and Members of the House to file statements with the Clerk regarding the intention to participate or not participate in the small donor financing system for such elections created by H.R. 1.

Mr. Speaker, the House will be considering two pieces of critically important legislation this week that are a long time coming.

H.R. 1, the For the People Act, will expand voting rights, limit partisan gerrymandering, improve election integrity, and revise rules for political spending and government ethics. The 2020 election brought out unprecedented turnout, even in the middle of the COVID-19 pandemic. Thanks in large part to voting by mail, more than 159 million Americans voted, the largest total vote turnout in United States history.

What followed was the most heavily scrutinized election in modern history, with our airwaves filled with horrific and dangerous lies that fundamentally damaged many people's faith in our democracy. Yet, through that entire ordeal, not a single shred of evidence of any systemic fraud was ever discovered—none at all.

Voting in this country, however, is far from perfect. Many people, particularly Americans of color and those from low-income families, face tremendous barriers to making their voices heard, from long lines at the polls to discriminatory ID laws.

I believe, and the Democratic majority believes, our national effort should be aimed at eliminating barriers to the ballot. We believe true participatory democracy can only be achieved when everyone—everyone—is afforded the opportunity to vote. We believe it is better for America that every voice be heard here in Washington, in State capitols, and in city, town, and village halls across our Nation.

It is better for all of our citizens when each and every citizen has a stake in what their government says and what their government does. And we believe it is better for us on the world stage when our democracy shines as a beacon of hope and success for others to emulate.

It is becoming increasingly clear that not everyone believes our national interest is served by greater voter participation. It is held in some quarters that, rather than seeing greater participation as a sign of our democracy's enduring strength, it is instead seen as evidence of a dark, sinister plot. Or perhaps, more cynically, they express that view because suppressing votes, particularly of those with whom they disagree, will improve their chances for electoral success, even though it weakens our democracy.

Rather than trying to build on the successes of record voter turnout, many of my friends on the other side of the aisle would rather turn their backs on those successes and begin an orga-

nized effort to change the rules because they didn't like the outcome.

The minority has put forward a narrative that suggests we must choose between two separate paths, accessibility and security. But that is a deliberately false narrative. We can, and we must, achieve both. H.R. 1 is the vehicle to advance both.

The For the People Act places a significant emphasis on election security, in everything from voter registration to ensuring all voting systems are secure with paper ballots and robust election result audits.

The outrage we have heard from Republican leaders in Congress demonstrates how out of touch they are with their own voters. More than two-thirds of likely voters, including 57 percent of Republicans, said they would back the proposals in H.R. 1. Americans want more accountability from their leaders, not less.

□ 1930

They want the influence of money out of politics. They want an end to gerrymandered districts. They want voting to be a celebration of our civil duty, not a constant battle to overcome administrative hurdles.

We owe it to those Americans to create the ethical and accessible democracy that they so richly deserve.

The House will also take up H.R. 1280, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. This legislation represents the work of hundreds of legislators and millions of American advocates who have fought for decades for a more equitable future.

This fight is especially personal for me, as my own community of Rochester, New York, has grappled with two recent tragedies that underscore just how necessary police reform truly is.

Just one block from here, on the west pediment of the United States Supreme Court, is a promise to every American: "Equal justice under law."

Sadly, we know that for too many Americans, that promise is an empty one. It was an empty promise for Daniel Prude, who, while naked and unarmed, faced a mental health crisis in the streets of Rochester when police arrived on the scene last March. He needed a warm blanket and treatment by a mental health professional. He got neither and died in police custody just days later.

It wasn't true just a month ago for a young girl in my community, who was forcibly restrained and pepper sprayed as she called out for her father. She is 9 years old. A police officer on the scene, impatient with her pleas to see her dad, urged her to stop acting like a child. Her response: "I am a child."

It would be laughable if it were not heartbreaking.

Equal justice under law was an empty promise for George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Jacob Blake, and for countless others in every corner of America and for countless more still to come unless we take bold, decisive action.

Indeed, it is up to each of us to make the changes necessary to finally fulfill the promise of equal justice.

The time for incremental change has passed. It is clear that we need a cultural paradigm shift and massive reimagining of our public safety protocols, and that starts with the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

The bill prohibits religious, racial, and discriminatory profiling by every police department in America, supported by improved training for officers and comprehensive data collection and tracking to ensure departments are following the law.

It will save lives by banning dangerous police practices, like choke holds and no-knock drug warrants. It will ensure that law enforcement uses deadly force only when absolutely necessary and only after exhausting deescalation tactics.

This legislation would limit the transfer of military-grade equipment to State and local law enforcement because peace, safety, and community trust cannot—cannot—be realized with weapons of war.

The George Floyd Justice in Policing Act will create desperately needed accountability by expanding the use of body-worn cameras and dashboard cameras and eliminating the qualified immunity protections that allow bad actors in law enforcement to stay on the force.

As a whole, this legislation addresses police misconduct, creates greater transparency, and affords victims meaningful avenues for redress. With these policies, we can build trust and we can begin to build cooperation between law enforcement and the communities they are supposed to serve and protect.

We passed both the For the People Act and the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act in the previous Congress, and it is my hope that this year represents a real opportunity to move both bills forward to the President's desk so that we can build stronger democracy and justice for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this rule and to support both underlying bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. MORELLE), my very good friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule covers two items, both of which will be familiar to Members who were here during the 116th Congress. We are once again considering H.R. 1, a bill that nationalizes our election system and substitutes Washington's judgment for a key responsibility of our States in the administration of free and fair elections. We are also considering H.R. 1280, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

Unfortunately, despite its title, H.R. 1 has nothing at all to do with the peo-

ple. It is, instead, a bill about preserving the present Democrat majority. It is a bill by Democrats for Democrats. Though the majority claims this bill is about reforming our political system, the reality is that most of the changes in this bill, if enacted into law, would be to benefit the majority to the detriment of the minority.

The most egregious of these provisions are those dedicated to changing our national system of campaign finance. Now, in general, I think this is a worthy goal, but the majority's proposed solution does not make much sense. The majority is proposing to create a new federally funded campaign ATM using corporate fines, ensuring that certain candidates will receive millions of dollars just for running a campaign.

My colleagues in the majority have bemoaned the massive amount of money that has been entering into our campaign system over the past few decades, yet their proposed solution is to dump corporate dollars into the system.

In what world does this make sense?

Even Democrats know what a flawed program this is, which is why today's rule also includes a provision to allow Members of Congress to opt out of this program. Before this bill was even passed by the House, Democrats were already running from it. They should just keep running and pull this bill from the floor.

Other proposed changes in this bill are just egregious. Wherever possible, the majority is attempting to impose one-size-fits-all systems from Washington onto the States. It does this with a one-size-fits-all voter registration system, including forcing States to provide same-day voter registration whether they want to or not.

It takes away the power of the States to choose how to redistrict, forcing them to adopt Washington-imposed "independent redirecting commissions," something that less than 20 percent of the States who undertake redistricting actually do.

These provisions impede the traditional power of the States to control their own elections. As a former secretary of state and election official in my home State of Oklahoma, I find these changes to be particularly concerning.

But what is worse, H.R. 1 also includes severe restrictions on free speech and repeals the Lois Lerner rule, a rule put into place after the IRS began targeting the speech of conservative organizations in determining whether or not they would qualify for tax exempt status. If enacted into law, these provisions would reweaponize the IRS and limit the abilities of organizations, corporations, and individuals to freely exercise this most-important right guaranteed under the Constitution.

How the majority can claim that this bill is for the people when they are blatantly restricting the people's right to

free speech is beyond my understanding.

Mr. Speaker, what the majority is attempting today is egregious. Changing the national campaign finance system to benefit themselves, taking traditional powers away from the States, and restricting the right of free speech are all part of an unprecedented power grab.

I strongly urge the majority to change course, and I urge my colleagues to reject this terrible bill.

Today, we are also considering H.R. 1280, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. As with H.R. 1, this bill will be familiar to our returning Members, as the House passed an identical bill last summer.

Unfortunately, while I think this bill is well-intentioned, it, too, is misguided. Reforms contained in H.R. 1280 will do more harm than good. I do not doubt the majority's good intentions with this legislation.

The George Floyd Justice in Policing Act came about following the tragic events of last summer. George Floyd's death demonstrated what so many Americans know only too well, that abuses of power clearly exist and must be grappled with.

And while the overwhelming majority of law enforcement officers faithfully and bravely carry out their duties and responsibilities each day, all too often many Americans receive different treatment due to the color of their skin. Americans across the country rightly condemn this horrific and unacceptable act.

Unfortunately, rather than choosing to come together to legislate in a bipartisan manner, the majority chose to take the exact opposite course last summer, and we are once again considering the same flawed and deeply partisan bill we considered then and that the Senate failed to take up. I believe this bill will face the same result, should the House pass it again this week.

During the last Congress, when the Judiciary Committee met to mark up this bill, the majority completely shut out Republicans from the process. Republicans made good-faith attempts to work with the Democrats to find common ground on needed reforms, yet every single one of these attempts were rejected.

This year, the majority has not even dignified to bring this bill to a markup in the Judiciary Committee, and, once again, the majority has shut Republicans out of the process.

This is no way to legislate on an issue that is this important, Mr. Speaker. Republicans and Democrats alike agree that reforms are necessary. We all watched the tragedy of George Floyd unfold last summer and we all watched the resulting protests. We all agree that action is necessary. But rather than working together in the best interest of the American people, the majority is once again telling Republicans that they can only have a

Hobson's choice. They can take the Democrats' bill or they can take the Democrats' bill with no other options.

But I, along with my fellow Republicans, reject that idea. We fully recognize the critical need for reform. My colleagues, both in the House and in the Senate, have put together our own package, the JUSTICE Act, filled with bipartisan reforms that could pass both the House and the Senate and be signed into law quickly. These reforms include critical measures, like providing funding for body cameras for police officers, requiring deescalation procedures, and banning choke holds.

My colleague, Representative STAUBER, offered this as an amendment at the Rules Committee earlier today, but, once again, the majority chose to shut out Republicans and refused to make this amendment in order.

That is a sad state of affairs, Mr. Speaker, but the real losers here are the American people. This is an issue we can and should cooperate on. I urge my colleagues in the majority to rethink the path they are on. On an issue that is this important and this critical to the American people, the very best thing we can do is work together. And with a reduced majority, I think that would actually be good political advice for my friends.

We can work on bipartisan reforms together and we can produce consensus legislation that has the buy-in of Members on both sides. Unfortunately, the majority has once again chosen the opposite path: Partisan bills filled with provisions that do not reflect the best interest or consensus of the country.

We can do better than that, Mr. Speaker. The American people deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to this rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just a brief comment. As much as it pains me, because I have nothing but incredible admiration and respect for my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, but when it comes to the question of voting in the United States, the fact is that States right now are working—many of them overtime—to restrict ballot access. That is why it is necessary for the Congress to step forward, as is given us, the power in the Constitution, to make sure that we pass laws that fulfill the dream of voter access for all Americans.

I do also note that I think it would be much easier for us to believe that there is good faith on the other side of the aisle to negotiate some of these items and to perhaps reach compromise, but I find it hard to believe—and I stated this in the Rules Committee—given what happened over the last several months, that we would be in this position, that there is any ability to have a belief in good faith.

It is hard to imagine 60 lawsuits were brought against decisions made by

States—not the Federal Government, but States—on the electoral college. Two-thirds of the members of the House Republican Conference—two-thirds—objected to the results of the electoral college, and, in many cases, States that had Republican leadership and Republicans serving as secretaries of state or as elections commissioners.

So I would suggest that since—for the first time since 1800, when John Adams turned over the keys to the White House to President Jefferson and we observed the first peaceful transfer of power from one party to another, that since that foundational moment in American history over two centuries ago, this is the first time that people in this House have objected so strenuously and systematically to the results of the free and fair election of the American people.

So we are for the people. We want to continue to expand ballot access, and we want nothing more than those wishes of the American public to be respected by their elected officials.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the chair of the Committee on House Administration.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Our democracy is in urgent need of repair. The American people deserve a transparent, inclusive, and healthy democracy, and H.R. 1 will get us there.

It is transformational, a once-in-a-generation, pro-democracy, anticorruption reform package. It is composed of comprehensive policies for eliminating structural and legal barriers to voting, ending the dominance of big money in our campaign finance reforms, and implementing real government ethics and accountability reforms.

With this landmark bill, we take a giant leap toward ensuring our Republic is an authentic and inclusive representative democracy, and ensuring the voices of everyday Americans are no longer drowned out by those of wealthy special interests.

□ 1945

Article I, Section 4 says this:

“The times, places and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations.”

Mr. Speaker, that is what we are doing here. As the gentleman has said, we had a huge turnout in the 2020 election, despite efforts by some to suppress turnout. Now, we see legislatures all over the country trying to put barriers in place so the American people will not be able to exercise their franchise. That is simply wrong. We should look to our constitutional obligation to make sure that every American has the capacity to vote.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER), my good friend, also a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member COLE for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1, which should more appropriately be titled, the for the politicians act, is nothing more than a top-down Federal power grab that nationalizes our elections and empowers the Democratic party to permanently hold on to their majority.

Article I, Section 4 of the U.S. Constitution gives States the primary role in establishing election law and in administering elections.

H.R. 1 upends this constitutional balance by forcing States to permanently expand mail-in voting, legalize ballot harvesting, and disregard voter ID laws. Even more alarming, this bill allows for the first-ever Federal funding of campaigns, creating a 6 to 1 government match to small-dollar donors. This means that for every \$200 donated, the Federal Government would contribute \$1,200. Additionally, certain voters will be given publicly funded vouchers to donate to candidates of their choice.

H.R. 1 also stifles free speech and empowers President Biden's IRS to target conservative organizations and deny them their tax-exempt status.

Last, but certainly not least, H.R. 1 increases vulnerability for foreign election interference at a time when we should be increasingly more vigilant about hostile regimes seeking to undermine our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule and “no” on H.R. 1.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1 is the most significant democracy reform package in a generation. It will make it easier to vote—regardless of income, ability, geography, or race; ends the domination of big money in politics; and enacts tougher ethics standards to ensure that public officials actually work for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud of three provisions that I helped incorporate into this bill:

Bringing the Oregon vote-by-mail model nationwide;

Paving the way for all States to offer vote-by-mail and early voting;

And automatic voter registration for individuals interacting with State agencies.

Mr. Speaker, this is personal for me. I started my political career as a college student, testifying before the Senate Judiciary Committee on the constitutional amendment to lower the voting age. I spent 2 years of my life working in Oregon on that and on the national campaign. Subsequently, I was on a national commission from the Ford Foundation, the National League of Women Voters, and the Civic League to deal with how we were to reform the election process to make it more uniform and easier for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud of that work, but I am a little embarrassed that that was four decades ago and we are still talking about the need for those reforms. And as my colleagues have mentioned, there are people right now in various State legislatures that are actively continuing a process of making it hard for Americans to vote. This is embarrassing. This isn't just a matter of what happened with civil rights, this has been refined as a high art to be able to gerrymander people into unrepresentative patterns that undercuts the ability of politicians selecting their voters, rather than people selecting their politicians.

Mr. Speaker, I have been pained by the lies that have been made about mail-in voting. I am the first Member of the House of Representatives to be elected as a result of a mail-in ballot. We pioneered that in 1996, and we have continued to pioneer that effort. And it is secure, it is convenient, it saves money for local government. It allows people to process this in their own home, in their own time, in their own way. In an era of the pandemic, it provides health—keeping older poll workers from being exposed.

The notion that somehow this is a problem that justified some of the outrageous statements and behavior, defies description.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Oregon an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am pained with this misrepresentation that the President of the United States would denigrate mail-in balloting while he, in fact, does it. This has been done by Republicans and Democrats alike. It is secure. It is safe. And it helps the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge approval of H.R. 1 and rejection of the bogus claims about the problems alleged with mail-in ballots. It is the most secure. It is the most effective. And it is one that I think the public deserves.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), my very good friend, and the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member COLE and the Committee on Rules. It was a fun day up there for a few hours.

This nearly 800-page bill that, if signed into law, would impact millions of Americans' right to vote and to participate in the political process, was introduced on January 4 of this year. And the first and only hearing on H.R. 1 was held just 4 days ago, in the smallest committee in Congress.

Democrats on the Committee on House Administration also decided a markup of this bill wasn't needed, despite the fact that both the bill itself and the membership of our committee have changed since last Congress. This

is especially concerning since Democrats changed House floor rules this Congress to weaken the MTR, making committees the only real opportunity for the minority to provide an alternative. But now, they are not even doing that. They are not even holding a markup on this major elections bill.

This bill was rushed. And I guarantee most of my colleagues supporting this bill have no idea how this bill would really impact elections or political speech. But I bet they do know that if this bill were to become law, they would get a lot more funds for their own campaigns through the public financing provision.

H.R. 1, the for the politicians act, includes hundreds of pages of mandates on States and local election administrators. At the only hearing Congress has held on this massive bill, the minority's witness was the only person on the panel with experience in actually running elections. And he told this committee that it would be unworkable in States like his.

Mr. Speaker, we should be reviewing the issues that we saw during the 2020 election cycle and helping States develop a better process. Simply mandating how States run their elections is not only unconstitutional, but it will lead to chaos and confusion for voters.

The for the politicians act creates a first-ever fund to publicly finance our own congressional campaigns by providing corporate money, the first corporate dollars allowed into individual Members of Congress' campaigns since 1907, laundered through the Federal Government and into Members of Congress' own campaigns.

Provisions in this bill also attack free speech protections under the First Amendment. We did not have any hearings on the impact of changing the current bipartisan balance of the Federal Election Commission to a partisan makeup or the effect that a "speech czar" will have on people's ability to participate in the political process.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is terrible. This bill doesn't address the important issues that deserve hearings. Any bill to fundamentally change our elections or restrict our freedom of speech needs—at the very least—to go through regular order. The American people deserve to know what is in this bill and the real-life impact it will have on them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule and on the underlying bill, and I figure my time has expired since you have the gavel.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Illinois, and I may not agree with him very much on this subject. But I really disagree if he thinks the Committee on Rules today was fun. He must be a heck of a cheap date.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), my good friend, and distinguished colleague from the Committee on Rules.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago, I began volunteering to provide election protection services to voters after I saw political operatives try to block Swarthmore College students from voting by posting signs around their campus saying that they could not legally vote where they attended college. That was a lie. But we had to get a court order to take the signs down.

Fast forward almost 20 years, and Haverford College students and their neighbors had to wage a multiyear campaign to get local officials to put a polling place on campus. The existing polling place was 1½ miles away, in another district entirely, and was inconvenient for students—most of whom had no cars—and the majority of residents alike.

The college offered to provide free space and parking for the polling place, but students and neighbors were met with excuse after excuse. These excuses were textbook voter suppression tactics used to box out young voters from making their voices heard.

If we have learned anything from this past election, it is that when we make it more convenient for eligible voters to vote, they do.

That is why I am offering an amendment to H.R. 1 that requires States which offer early voting to make it available to polling places serving college campuses. It is high time we make our democracy, our elections, accessible to the generations who will inherit the world that we are legislating about.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule, to support my amendment, and to support final passage of H.R. 1.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, my friend and I disagree on the two pieces of legislation today, but we absolutely agree that the Committee on Rules' meeting was not fun.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. GREENE), my friend.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition today against H.R. 1280. This bill is nothing more than a get-cops-killed campaign. It sends one clear message: Democrats hate law enforcement.

This bill does not bring justice to victims. It just takes revenge on all of the men and women in uniform. Meanwhile, Speaker PELOSI is surrounded by an army of taxpayer-funded law enforcement 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

This bill disarms cops and opens them to frivolous lawsuits by lawyers representing criminals who got their feelings hurt simply because they broke the law and got arrested.

Speaker PELOSI is putting police on a hit list to be ambushed while on the job keeping our streets safe. So I have one message for Democrats: Shame on you.

Shame on you for using these men and women to protect your fortress

while destroying their rights and livelihoods. Don't call a cop for help if this is how you are going to treat them. You should tell them to go home. At least then, they won't have to stand guard while you dismantle everything they stand for.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2000

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), my very good friend and the ranking member of the House Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it seems like we were just here, debating a COVID relief bill that was not about COVID relief but Democrats' special interests. Now, we are debating the rule for the so-called For the People Act, but it is not for the people but against the people, against our freedom, and against our fundamental right to vote.

H.R. 1, the Democrats' plan to nationalize elections, stack the deck in their favor, and pad their campaign accounts with corporate money laundered through the IRS, is exactly what this country does not need.

What we do need are States carrying out Federal elections with integrity and transparency, as the Constitution dictates. We need American voters to have confidence in the voting process.

That is what my amendment was designed to do. Mr. Speaker, while leaving the details and specifics of elections to the States, my amendment would create two simple standards to promote integrity and transparency. My amendment would provide standards and best practices for postelection audits and would be published online by each State within 30 days after the election. My amendment would require States to attest to the security and accuracy of their voter ID requirements and maintenance of voter registration lists.

While H.R. 1 actually forbids voter ID laws, Mr. Speaker, you have to have an ID to buy tobacco and alcohol in this country. What is the problem with having to identify who you are to vote?

Two simple provisions to promote integrity and transparency, but my colleagues across the aisle must not be here for integrity, transparency, and improving voter confidence in our elections because they wouldn't even make my amendment in order.

Mr. Speaker, since we can't have a debate in committee or here on the floor, I will file the Voter ID Act, and then maybe my friends can explain to the American people why they are opposed to election integrity and transparency and what is wrong with having to verify the identification of voters.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to again just note, although it has been said ad nauseam for the last several months, that while we clearly respect States' roles in these elections and that it is the States who run elections and organize them, we do have the power in the Congress given to us in the Constitution. But more importantly, this year, while the voters in Georgia, Pennsylvania, and Arizona cast ballots in free and fair and open elections, and those were certified repeatedly despite an onslaught of lawsuits brought by the former President and his advocates, all of which were denied going all the way up to the Supreme Court, our colleagues didn't respect those States' elections even though they were certified and even though, as we all met on what will be one of the darkest days in American history on January 6 to accept and certify those results given to us by the States, my colleagues and friends objected to them.

I am not sure what that says about their respect for State elections since they didn't respect the results of those elections, in many cases run by Republicans in their respective States.

Mr. Speaker, I must say I find this a most curious discussion. If we are not going to abide by the results of elections, and if we are not going to trust those various States to submit elections unless they agree with the outcome that we want, why we would be arguing so strenuously for the continuation of State control and no involvement by the Federal Government, despite the fact that the Constitution clearly vests that power here in the Congress?

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just quickly to my friend from New York, I wasn't here, and he wasn't here, but our friends thought to challenge in this Chamber the election in 2001, after 2000. I was here in 2004 when they challenged a State and demanded a recount. Then, I was here in 2017 when my friends on the other side sought to challenge 10 different States. So, let's not act like this is somehow unusual.

Mr. Speaker, another part of today's rule includes a provision to deem passed a correction to last week's budget reconciliation measure. Given that the majority now wishes to reopen last week's reconciliation, it is certainly appropriate to further amend that resolution to correct one of the more egregious provisions in it.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately adopt H. Res. 178, an engrossment correction to strike funding in the budget reconciliation bill for the Pelosi subway tunnel in California and instead direct the \$140 million to support mental health and suicide prevention in States where children do not have the option of in-person instruction in school.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Mrs. BICE), my good friend, for further explanation of the amendment.

Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question today, we will call up a resolution that I introduced, H. Res. 178, which would instruct the House Clerk to modify the text of H.R. 1319, the American Rescue Plan Act, to direct \$140 million from Speaker PELOSI's pork subway project and to instead put those funds toward critical mental health services for the Nation's children who have continued to suffer in isolation during the COVID-19 pandemic.

My resolution would ensure that mental health and suicide prevention services are provided in States where children do not have the option of in-person instruction in school, as isolation has been a major driver of mental health impacts on our Nation's kids.

Mr. Speaker, children across this Nation have been disproportionately affected by the mental health impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. A study by the National Institutes of Health found that social isolation has had a significant impact on America's children. Social isolation during quarantine has caused many to develop feelings of sadness, anxiety, and loneliness.

Unfortunately, a study by the American Academy of Pediatrics found that there has been an increase in suicides among children following the imposition of stay-at-home orders last year.

Another study by the Virginia Pediatrics Association found a 90 percent rise in cases among children involving depression, anxiety, and academic struggles.

Mr. Speaker, there is hope. The CDC recently released new guidelines that recommend students return to in-person instruction where it can be done safely. Dr. Anthony Fauci himself has backed these new guidelines and has spoken in support of getting our Nation's kids back in school.

The feelings of social isolation felt by so many children today can be quickly alleviated by reopening our schools. In areas of the country where reopenings are not happening, my resolution would provide \$140 million to bolster mental healthcare for these affected children. I think we can all agree that the mental health impacts on our children should be swiftly addressed on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. Speaker, let me state again that America's children deserve the very best. Let's defeat the previous question today so that we can provide needed relief and critical mental health services

to children who are suffering across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to defeat the previous question.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated when I began my comments this evening, I have nothing but the greatest admiration and respect for the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee.

I don't want to be argumentative, but I would note that I think there is a significant and substantial difference between a symbolic objection made by one or two Members to the electoral college results of a single State versus the objection of 140 Members of this House, particularly as it follows a violent, unprecedented attack on what I consider the sacred cathedral of democracy, the United States Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, obviously, I oppose the rule. The majority is proposing two significant pieces of legislation today that are, unfortunately, both deeply partisan. In neither case has the majority allowed Republicans to be involved in the process of legislating.

Mr. Speaker, on H.R. 1, the majority is proposing a deeply troubling takeover of election practices that will benefit only Democrats. The bill will take away the traditional powers of the States to run their own elections as they see fit, imposing a one-size-fits-all regime from Washington.

It dumps huge amounts of corporate money into the campaign finance system, particularly benefitting certain candidates. It imposes severe restrictions on free speech that are anathema to a free and fair election.

On H.R. 1280, the majority is once again seeking to pass the same flawed police reform bill it passed last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we had a real opportunity here for both Democrats and Republicans to work together to pass real reforms for the American people. Instead of taking "yes" for an answer, the majority is instead seeking to impose a deeply partisan bill that will not fix the problems or help heal the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we deserve better than that. The American people are best served when their Representatives in Congress can come together and work in a bipartisan manner. One side attempting to impose partisan legislation on the country does us all a disservice.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to rethink this path, reject both of these bills, and return to the negotiating table and work with Republicans for a brighter future for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I mean this with all sincerity. There is a great gap between us on H.R. 1. We just simply look at this matter differently. I think it is egregious

partisan overreach. On H.R. 1280, there really is an opportunity for bipartisan cooperation. The JUSTICE Act that Mr. STAUBER filed last year and presented today as an amendment has a great deal in common with some of the objectives I know my friends want to achieve on their side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, in an almost evenly divided House and an evenly divided Senate that still has the filibuster, you can't do things by reconciliation every day. Most days, to get much done, it is going to require bipartisan cooperation.

We often say that never happens. The reality is it happens a lot more than people acknowledge. Five times last year we came together as Republicans and Democrats and passed COVID relief packages that made a big difference in this country. We also passed the spending bill on a bipartisan basis that funded the government for this entire fiscal year. We did that in the middle of a Presidential election year that was extraordinarily divisive.

Mr. Speaker, we can work together. I would ask my friends to rethink the course of the reconciliation bill and now these two pieces of legislation and start thinking about where we can actually get things done. I think the George Floyd bill, H.R. 1280, is one of those places. I also think the appropriations process can be one of those places. We can probably even find some common ground on some of the electoral issues, although personally, in my view, H.R. 1 is a very flawed piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from New York for the debate and tell him that, despite our disagreements on these two pieces of legislation, I look forward to working with him. I don't think either of these are likely to get through the United States Senate. I do think we can get a product back from the United States Senate that both of us might be able to vote for, in terms of police justice and overhaul. We will wait and see what happens with H.R. 1. I am less optimistic we will ever see it again, but I am happy to say good-bye to it out of this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I urge rejection of the rule and I urge rejection of both underlying pieces of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much, as always, the thoughtful comments by my colleague and friend, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. Speaker, as it relates to the question of matters before us here, we do have significant differences in how we view access to the ballot.

I would note that, historically, parties change. They evolve. Typically, because this is in keeping with American democracy, we evolve to reflect

the needs and concerns and wishes and results of American elections and their expression of the will of the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, what I find troubling right now is that friends across the aisle seem to be focused not so much on learning the lessons given to us by those voters, by the American public, as expressed in the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November.

But instead, conscientious, by-design work to limit those who would want access to the ballot so that they can choose the voters, as opposed to the other way around—disenfranchising those, and setting up barriers, as we see happening in State capitals across the country, is troubling indeed. And, I think, it demonstrates the clear division between the two parties on this particular issue.

□ 2015

We seek, and we will always seek, to expand access to make sure that every single American, every single citizen who wants to participate in our democracy has the right, because that is how we end up with a better America, and we fulfill the promise of moving toward a more perfect Union.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all of my colleagues for their words in support of the rule before us today. I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and a "yes" vote on the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. COLE is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 179

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 7. House Resolution 178 is hereby adopted.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 201, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

YEAS—220

Adams	Boyle, Brendan	Cicilline
Aguilar	F.	Clark (MA)
Allred	Brown	Clarke (NY)
Auchincloss	Brownley	Cleaver
Axne	Bush	Clyburn
Barragán	Bustos	Cohen
Bass	Butterfield	Connolly
Beatty	Carbajal	Cooper
Bera	Cárdenas	Correa
Beyer	Carson	Costa
Bishop (GA)	Cartwright	Courtney
Blumenauer	Case	Craig
Blunt Rochester	Casten	Crist
Bonamici	Castor (FL)	Crow
Bourdeaux	Castro (TX)	Cuellar
Bowman	Chu	Dauids (KS)

Fleischmann	Keller	Reschenthaler
Fortenberry	Kelly (MS)	Rice (SC)
Fox	Kelly (PA)	Rodgers (WA)
Franklin, C.	Kim (CA)	Rogers (AL)
Scott	Kind	Rogers (KY)
Fulcher	Kinzing	Rose
Gaetz	Kustoff	Rosendale
Gallagher	LaHood	Rouzer
Garbarino	LaMalfa	Roy
Garcia (CA)	Lamborn	Rutherford
Gibbs	Latta	Salazar
Jimenez	LaTurner	Scalise
Gohmert	Lesko	Schweikert
Golden	Long	Scott, Austin
Gonzales, Tony	Lucas	Simpson
Gonzalez (OH)	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
Good (VA)	Mace	Smith (NE)
Gooden (TX)	Malliotakis	Smith (NJ)
Gosar	Mann	Smucker
Granger	Massie	Spartz
Graves (LA)	Mast	Staub
Green (TN)	McCarthy	Steel
Greene (GA)	McCaul	Stefanik
Griffith	McClain	Steil
Grothman	McClintock	Steube
Guest	McHenry	Stewart
Guthrie	McKinley	Stivers
Hagedorn	Meijer	Taylor
Harris	Meuser	Tenney
Harshbarger	Miller (IL)	Thompson (PA)
Hartzler	Miller (WV)	Tiffany
Hern	Miller-Meeks	Timmons
Herrell	Moolenaar	Turner
Herrera Beutler	Mooney	Upton
Hice (GA)	Moore (AL)	Valadao
Higgins (LA)	Moore (UT)	Van Drew
Hill	Mullin	Van Dine
Hinson	Murphy (NC)	Wagner
Hollingsworth	Nehls	Walberg
Hudson	Newhouse	Walorski
Huizenga	Norman	Waltz
Issa	Nunes	Weber (TX)
Jackson	Obernolte	Webster (FL)
Jacobs (NY)	Owens	Wenstrup
Johnson (LA)	Palazzo	Westerman
Johnson (OH)	Palmer	Williams (TX)
Johnson (SD)	Pence	Wilson (SC)
Jordan	Perry	Womack
Joyce (OH)	Pfuger	Zeldin
Joyce (PA)	Posey	
Katko	Reed	

NOT VOTING—6

Crenshaw	Loudermilk	Wittman
Graves (MO)	Sessions	Young

□ 2151

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on Monday, March 1, 2021.

On the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule, H. Res. 179, if I had been present, I would have voted YES.

On H. Res. 179, the rule Providing for consideration of H.R. 1 and H.R. 1280, if I had been present, I would have voted YES.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Beatty (Johnson)	Granger	Lieu (Beyer)
(GA)	(Arrington)	Lowenthal
Buchanan	Grijalva (Garcia)	(Beyer)
(LaHood)	(IL)	McEachin
Cárdenas	Hastings	(Wexton)
(Gomez)	(Wasserman)	Meng (Clark)
DeSaulnier	Schultz	(MA)
(Matsui)	Higgins (NY)	Moore (WI)
DesJarlais	(Kildee)	(Beyer)
(Fleischmann)	Horsford (Kildee)	Moulton
Deutch (Rice)	Huffman	(Trahan)
(NY)	(McNerney)	Mrvan (Kelly)
Frankel, Lois	Katko (Stefanik)	(IL)
(Clark (MA))	Kind (Connolly)	Nadler (Jeffries)
Fudge (Kaptur)	Kirkpatrick	Napolitano
Gaetz (McHenry)	(Stanton)	(Correa)
Gonzalez,	Langevin	Neguse
(Lynch)	(Lynch)	(Perlmutter)
Vicente	Lawson (FL)	Norman (Rice)
(Gomez)	(Evans)	(SC)

Palazzo	Rodgers (WA)	Thompson (MS)
(Fleischmann)	(Herrera)	(Butterfield)
Payne	Beutler	Timmons (Green)
(Wasserman)	Roybal-Allard	(TN)
Schultz	(Escobar)	Vargas (Correa)
Pingree (Kuster)	Ruiz (Aguilar)	Watson Coleman
Reed (Arrington)	Rush	(Pallone)
	(Underwood)	Wilson (FL)
	Speier (Scanlon)	(Hayes)

DIRECTING THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO MAKE A CORRECTION IN THE ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1319

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 6(a) of House Resolution 179, H. Res. 176 is hereby adopted.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 176

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall, in the engrossment of the bill H.R. 1319, make the following corrections:

(1) Strike section 2103 and redesignate section 2104 as section 2103 (and amend the table of contents in section 2 accordingly).

(2) Strike paragraph (5) in section 2401(a).

(3) Redesignate paragraphs (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), and (11) in section 2401(a) as paragraphs (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), and (10), respectively.

(4) In paragraph (7) of section 2401(a), as redesignated by paragraph (3), strike “paragraphs (5), (6), (7), and (9)” and insert “paragraphs (5), (6), and (8)”.

(5) In paragraph (8) of section 2401(a), as so redesignated, strike “paragraph (6)(C)” and insert “paragraph (5)(C)”.

(6) Strike paragraph (5) in section 9501(a).

(7) Redesignate paragraphs (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), and (11) of section 9501(a) as paragraphs (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), and (10), respectively.

(8) In paragraph (7) of section 9501(a), as redesignated by paragraph (7), strike “paragraphs (5), (6), (7), and (9)” and insert “paragraphs (5), (6), and (8)”.

(9) In paragraph (8) of section 9501(a), as so redesignated, strike “paragraph (6)(C)” and insert “paragraph (5)(C)”.

AUTHORIZING CANDIDATES FOR ELECTION TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO FILE STATEMENTS WITH THE CLERK REGARDING THE INTENTION TO PARTICIPATE OR NOT PARTICIPATE IN THE SMALL DONOR FINANCING SYSTEM FOR SUCH ELECTIONS UNDER TITLE V OF THE FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT OF 1971.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 6(b) of House Resolution 179, H. Res. 177 is hereby adopted.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 177

Resolved,
SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF FILING OF STATEMENTS REGARDING INTENT TO PARTICIPATE OR NOT PARTICIPATE IN SMALL DONOR FINANCING SYSTEM FOR HOUSE CANDIDATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—At the time a candidate for nomination or election for the office of Member of the House of Representatives files with the Clerk the report required under section 101(c) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1989, or a Member of the House of Rep-

resentatives files with the Clerk the report required under section 101(d) of such Act, the candidate or Member may file a statement indicating whether or not the candidate or Member intends to be a participating candidate under title V of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as added by part 2 of subtitle B of title V of the For the People Act of 2021) with respect to the next election for such office which is held after the candidate or Member files the report and for which the small donor financing system under such title is in effect.

(b) POSTING.—The Clerk shall post on the official public website of the Office of the Clerk each statement filed under subsection (a).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply with respect to reports filed on or after the date of the adoption of this resolution.

UNVEILING OF COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA, MONUMENT

(Mr. CLYBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, tomorrow, at noon, the city of Columbia, South Carolina, Historic Columbia, and the University of South Carolina will unveil a monument that will mark the 60th anniversary of the landmark case *Edwards v. South Carolina*.

That case resulted from the protest march of almost 200 college and high school students from across South Carolina who came to Columbia to protest segregation, discrimination, and what amounted to apartheid.

Madam Speaker, 192 or 193 of us were arrested on that day, and 189 were convicted. Two years later, the Supreme Court of the United States overturned those convictions in this historic and landmark case against South Carolina, which rendered an end to any State passing laws to subject protest marchers to anything but what they were.

Madam Speaker, tomorrow, I will submit a full statement, thanking those for doing so.

CELEBRATING 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF MOSES LAKE BAPTIST CHURCH

(Mr. NEWHOUSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to celebrate the 10th anniversary of Moses Lake Baptist Church and to sincerely thank them for their contributions to the Moses Lake community.

Madam Speaker, central Washingtonians are people of deep and sincere faith. We know firsthand that churches and faith-based organizations like the Moses Lake Baptist Church are fundamental to the well-being and very fiber of our local communities.

From performing acts of service, to ensuring the spiritual and emotional health of their congregants, particularly during the challenging times of the past year, Moses Lake Baptist Church goes above and beyond to deliver the Word of God to individuals